

** NOT FOR PRINTED PUBLICATION **

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

LUFKIN DIVISION

TOMMY WILLIS §
VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:20cv191
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID §

ORDER OVERRULING PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS AND ACCEPTING
THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Petitioner Tommy Willis, an inmate confined in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, proceeding *pro se*, brought this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

The court referred this matter to the Honorable Zack Hawthorn, United States Magistrate Judge, at Beaumont, Texas, for consideration pursuant to applicable laws and orders of this court. The Magistrate Judge recommends dismissing the petition as a second or successive petition for which petitioner failed to first obtain permission from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Alternatively, the Magistrate Judge recommends dismissing the petition as barred by limitations.

The court has received and considered the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge filed pursuant to such order, along with the record and pleadings. Petitioner filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. This requires a *de novo* review of the objections in relation to the pleadings and the applicable law. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b).

After careful consideration, the court concludes petitioner's objections should be overruled. Petitioner has previously filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in this court attacking his

conviction. *See Willis v. Director*, Civil Action No. 9:00cv271 (E.D. Tex. 2000). Accordingly, petitioner was required to obtain permission from the appropriate court of appeals prior to filing this petition. As petitioner did not obtain prior permission from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, the petition should be dismissed. Additionally, petitioner's current petition is barred by the applicable one-year statute of limitations. A state application for writ of habeas corpus which is filed after the federal limitations period has expired does not revive any portion of the fully-expired limitations period. *See Villegas v. Johnson*, 184 F.3d 467, 472 (5th Cir. 1999).

Furthermore, petitioner is not entitled to the issuance of a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying federal habeas corpus relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253; FED. R. APP. P. 22(b). The standard for granting a certificate of appealability, like that for granting a certificate of probable cause to appeal under prior law, requires the movant to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004); *see also Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1982). In making that substantial showing, the movant need not establish that he should prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability is resolved in favor of the movant, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 849 (2000).

Here, petitioner has not shown that any of the issues raised by his claims are subject to debate among jurists of reason. The factual and legal questions advanced by the movant are not novel and have been consistently resolved adversely to his position. In addition, the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. Therefore, petitioner has failed to make a sufficient showing to merit the issuance of a certificate of appealability. Accordingly, a certificate of appealability shall not be issued.

O R D E R

Petitioner's objections are **OVERRULED**. The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the Magistrate Judge are correct and the report of the Magistrate Judge is **ACCEPTED**. A final judgment will be entered in this case in accordance with the Magistrate Judge's recommendations.

So Ordered and Signed

Jul 6, 2021



Ron Clark
Senior Judge